

## **AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS**

Replacement sheet of drawings are enclosed for the Examiner's approval. The attached sheet of drawings include changes to Fig. 2. This sheet, which includes Fig. 2, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 2. In figure 2, the engaging portions of the mounting sleeves 22 are not visible.

In addition, a marked-up copy (with annotations) of the amended figure 2 is also enclosed for the Examiner's approval.

Attachment:

Replacement Sheet

Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed, and reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

### **DRAWING OBJECTION**

The drawings were originally objected to because in Figure 2, it appears that the engaging portions of the mounting sleeves 22 should not be visible.

Responsive to this, Figure 2 is corrected in accordance with the Examiner's instruction, and it is believed that the objection should be removed.

### **SPECIFICATION OBJECTION**

The disclosure was originally objected to because of some informalities.

Responsive to this, the specification is corrected in accordance with the Examiner's instruction, and it is believed that the objection should be removed.

In addition, the abstract of the disclosure was originally objected to because of some informalities.

Responsive to this, the abstract is corrected in accordance with the Examiner's instruction, and it is believed that the objection should be removed.

### **CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112**

Claims 17 and 18 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

However, the Examiner has pointed out that claims 17 and 18 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112,

second paragraph, set forth in this Office Action.

Responsive to this, claims 17 and 18 are amended according to the Examiner's instruction. Therefore, it is believed that, by the amendments, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, should be removed and the amended claims 17 and 18 should be allowable.

In addition, the Examiner also pointed out that claims 1-16 have been allowed.

Accordingly, the claims 1-18 should be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, he is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Alan Kamrath", is written over a horizontal line.

by Alan D. Kamrath

Attorney for Applicant

Nikolai & Mersereau, P.A.  
900 Second Avenue South  
Suite 820  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3813

2

